Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.
Kant, Immanuel. *Crítica de la razón pura*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 1978.
Kristeva, Julia. *Semeiotiké: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969.
———. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
Martínez Fernández, José Enrique. *La intertextualidad literaria (Base teórica y práctica textual)*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2001.
Miguel, Amando de. *Introducción a la sociología de la vida cotidiana*. Madrid: Edicusa, 1969.
———. *La vida cotidiana de los españoles en el siglo XX*. Barcelona: Planeta, 2001.
Navarro Casabona, Alberto. *Introducción al pensamiento estético de Gilles Deleuze*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch, 2001.
Ortega y Gasset, José. *El tema de nuestro tiempo*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1976.
———. *Historia como sistema*. Madrid: Alianza, 1981.
París, Carlos. *El animal cultural. Biología y cultura en la realidad humana*. Barcelona: Crítica, 1994.
Reyes, Graciela. *Polifonía textual. La citación en el relato literario*. Madrid: Gredos, 1984.
Roas, David. "La amenaza de lo fantástico." *Teorías de lo fantástico*. David Roas, Ed. Madrid: ARCO/LIBROS, (2001): 7-46.
Sádaba, Javier. *Saber vivir*. Madrid: Ediciones Libertarias, 1984.
Stivale, Charles. *The Two-Fold Thought of Deleuze and Guattari*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1998.
Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.
———. *Genres in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
———. *An Introduction to Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1981.
———. *The Poetics of Prose*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
Tomeo, Javier. *El cazador*. Zaragoza: Mira, 1993.
———. *El unicornio*. Barcelona: Bruguera, 1971.
———. *La ciudad de las palomas*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 1989.
———. *El canto de las tortugas*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 1998.
———. *Napoleón VII*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 1999.
———. *Bestiario*. Zaragoza: Prames-Las Tres Sorores, 2000.
———. *La patria de las hormigas*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2000.
———. *La soledad de los pirómanos*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2001.

REFASHIONING JOSÉ HERNÁNDEZ THROUGH FRANCISCO F. FERNÁNDEZ'S *SOLANÉ:* THE SHIFTING POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES AMONG FEDERALIST REFORMISTS

by Miguel A. Fernández
Middlebury College

In early 1871, Gerónimo de Solané, a *curandero* or folk medicine man with a vague past, arrived in the small frontier town of Tandil, two hundred miles south of Buenos Aires, and with his powers of healing and prophecy soon attracted people from all over the countryside and created a popular following. Along with his cures and herbal remedies, 'Tata Dios,' as his followers referred to Solané, preached a blend of Catholicism and mysticism, and spoke out against foreigners who he felt exploited the country, and Masons who he saw as an evil society with no religion.

On New Year's Eve, 1871, Solané's assistant, Jacinto Pérez, gathered together a group of some forty gaucho adherents and told them that the prophet Solané had predicted the end of the world and a last judgement. [1] He harranged them to unite against the forces of evil and help give rise to a new people. The participants were handed red ribbons for their hats and at dawn on 1 January 1872, set off for the main square in Tandil shouting "¡Viva la Confederación! ¡Viva la religión! ¡Mueran los gringos y masones!". [2] The sole prisoner in the town jail was freed, arms from the courthouse armory were gathered, and the band set off on a murderous rampage. They slaughtered thirty-six individuals, almost all immigrants. A posse killed ten of the gauchos, including Jacinto Pérez, captured eight, and the rest escaped.

Even though he had not participated in any of the action and disavowed any knowledge of the massacre, Gerónimo Solané was arrested. Once in jail

he refused to discuss the massacre, saying that he would reserve any further comments until the arrival of an impartial justice of the peace from another county. But his promise to testify would never come to fruition because he was shot to death through a small window in his cell by unknown assailants. [3]

In his drama *Solané*, Francisco Felipe Fernández novelizes some of the actual events of the massacre that occurred in Tandil on New Year's Day 1872. *Solané* is intriguing because Fernández took a real event, a police report and a crime, idealized the situation and used it for his own didactic purposes. This was the first time that Fernández used a 'popular' subject, even though he had written historical dramas previously (e.g. *El 25 de Mayo de 1810*). *Solané* did not appear in print until 1881 when Casavalle published it in Fernández's *Obras Dramáticas*. [4] Most critics agree that the play, with its gaucho characters and language, was written at the end of 1872 (see Castagnino 114; Furt 268; Parodi 13.) This same year saw the publication of three key narrative gauchesque poems. José Hernández's *El gaucho Martín Fierro*, Hilario Ascasubi's *Santos Vega o los mellizos de La Flor*, and Antonio Lussich's *Los tres gauchos orientales*, were in some ways the culmination of the gauchesque genre that began with Bartolomé Hidalgo, whose dialogues combined a sour criticism of the government with the spontaneity of popular verse. Hidalgo created a new type of political poetry that transformed the emotions and sentiments of oral poetry into a written form. [5] Hernández, Ascasubi and Lussich successfully imitated the authentic voice of the gaucho and managed to emotionally identify with the imagination of the rural workers and to break down the barrier that separated the literary elite from the mass public. Francisco Fernández's *Solané* is the first Argentine play to incorporate gaucho dialect and lexicon.

Jacobo De Diego, one of Fernández's biographers, has argued the play is the first social drama produced in Argentina (33). While this statement might be easy to disprove, we can assert that *Solané* was the first theatrical exposition of the conflict between the gaucho and the authority of the city, and hence Fernández was a precursor of Argentine modern theater, in particular of the Juan Moreira genre that would appear in the coming decade.

> Por sus características, por la índole del protagonista, por los conflictos a que se ve abocado y la persecución que sufre, por el contenido de crítica a un módulo político, por el alegato en pro de un tipo social – el gaucho – avasallado y explotado por la ciudad y el progreso, *Solané* es, en el teatro, el antecedente inmediato de la corriente moreirista que transforma a un resentido social en héroe legendario. (Castagnino 113-14)

Fernández later corrected his play and wrote a second version that was published posthumously by the Instituto de Literatura Argentina in their series *Orígenes del Teatro Nacional* in 1926. A comparison of the two versions of

the play reveals significant changes in the political messages being emitted. This is not only of interest for explanation of political, cultural and social events taking shape during the years of Argentine national organization, but more importantly it helps shed light on the dramatic transition in ideological orientation among some of the country's most important writers who supported the interior provinces' struggle against the unjust treatment by Buenos Aires. The changes seen between the two versions of *Solané* delineate Felipe Fernández's move from a strong Federalist and provincial position to a more liberal and nationally tolerant ideology, and illustrate the reactions to the changing political atmosphere in Argentina from the late 1860s through the mid 1880s. [6] Fernández's trajectory reflects similar transitions carried out by some of Argentina's most noteworthy nineteenth-century poets: José Hernández, Carlos Guido y Spano, and Olegario Andrade, among others.

Fernández was militantly anti-Buenos Aires and a fervent supporter of his native Entre Ríos province. In his opinion all of the ills of his province stemmed from a government that came to power illegally through voter fraud and excessive influence of the central government. This administration then appointed deputies, mayors, justices and commanders and the system perpetuated itself, denying the rights of local citizens and making it practically impossible for them to earn a decent and honest living or to find justice in the system of government.

A careful look at the writing and reworking of *Solané* shows us the hostility and strength of passion that Fernández felt against Buenos Aires and its biased policies. By looking at the cultural conditions that surrounded the production of his texts, we are able to peer into the mind of a provincial thinker. We discover, contrary to Fermín Chávez's attempts to paint him as a standard-bearer for the conservative Federalists, that Fernández was a progressive thinker, much like José Hernández, who battled for individuals' rights as guaranteed by the constitution and against forces that would deny these rights. Hernández formed part of a generation of young writers allied to the Federalists, with progressive, liberal ideas. This group of reformist, liberal federalists, who apart from the author of *Martín Fierro* included Carlos Guido y Spano, Lucio V. Mansilla, Olegario V. Andrade, and several others, had a humanitarian quality about them; they were not so much interested in the problem of society as a whole, rather in the individual's relationship to society and the role he played and ought to play in society (Hulet 236). These Reformists promoted a populist agenda in their defense of the individual rights and liberties of the rural workers and oppressed. The aforementioned ideas of the reformists, combined with their positive views on progress, democracy, a government founded on laws, support for immigration into the interior, and education for the masses, shifted the political battles away from Unitarians versus Federalists and emphasized the battle between Buenos Aires and her productive capacity and riches against the provinces of the interior and their poverty.

The leading figure of this group was José Hernández who doggedly battled against *porteño* centralism from the pages of the newspaper *El Río de la Plata* and later through the narrative poem *El gaucho Martín Fierro*, which immortalized him. Hernández founded *El Río de la Plata* in 1870 along with some of the other most influential defenders of the Confederation. The description of the newspaper's goals that Hernández penned in the first issue could almost be taken as the ideology of the men of the Confederation.

> Situado en una línea de ideas independientes tanto de Sarmiento y Mitre, como de Urquiza, el diario sostendrá algunas postulaciones esenciales: defensa de los hombres de la campaña, oposición total y sistemática a la guerra del Paraguay y ataque a los intereses brasileros, postulación incansable del régimen municipal y el juicio por jurados, concordia y unión nacional, libertad bien entendida para todos, igualdad ante la ley, federalismo político y económico, proteccionismo industrial y nacionalismo económico. (qtd. in Borello 73)

A close look at Francisco F. Fernández's historical drama *Solané* reveals similar aims and methods to those used by Hernández to challenge the ideas emanating from Buenos Aires as to how the new nation was to be organized and governed. As we will see, there are striking similarities among the themes, tone, and intended public of Hernández and Fernández, as well as their political tendencies and activity. So much so that they suggest more than an influence, almost a school of thought.

It has been suggested that over the seven years that elapsed between the two parts of *Martín Fierro* the poet abandoned his political ideals and sold out his working class constituency (e.g. Martínez Estrada 726-38). Martínez Estrada and others generally state that once Hernández was branded with literary success, prosperity and a political career soon followed and the bard dramatically switched allegiances and cuddled up to the Buenos Aires oligarchy he had earlier battled so fiercely. It can be argued that José Hernández's political flip-flopping was not an isolated or individual case; a group of intellectuals who supported the provinces of the interior drifted around the political spectrum in a comparable fashion. José Hernández's political inconsistencies do not reflect indecision or lack of ideology on his part; rather they are characteristic of a group of provincial writers' evolution prompted by changes in economic, political, and social climates. A close reading of the two versions of Francisco Fernández's play *Solané* and the cultural and historical milieu in which they were created and reworked provides a clearer understanding of this era that was marked by an appeal to the masses in literature, emphasis on individual rights, and a shift to a progressive form of federalism.

Fernández's *Solané*

The original drama, labeled a "drama histórico contemporáneo," is quite melodramatic and begins with Solané seeking revenge on his former love, Genoveva, a beautiful woman from the upper class, by having her daughter Lelia kidnapped. Solané berates Lelia, accusing her class of carrying out grave injustices upon the gauchos and shunning them from society. In the second part of the first act, sick people seeking his help and fanatic followers attentive to his words surround Solané. Here he speaks of their need to believe in God and that they will be called to action in four days time, on 1 January 1872. "Dios los destina á ustedes á esterminar á los herejes masones, y á sus cómplices . . . . Vengo a salvar al gaucho de las garras de la tiranía y de la corrupción de la fe religiosa." [7] Lelia's father and soldiers arrive to hear Solané's words of impending doom and call him a fanatic and a phony for inciting good people to rebellion. As the two men are about to confront one another, Genoveva appears on scene to demand her daughter's return. Solané threatens Lelia, but his current woman, Mica, protects the girl from harm.

The second act takes place in Genoveva's home where she admits to her father that she feels love for the *curandero.* Solané appears in the house and explains how he fell in love with her when he was called to the same house seventeen years earlier to cure her. He reminds Genoveva that when her father realized that the *curandero* was in love with her, he sent the Justice of the peace after Solané and had him banished from the district. Genoveva cannot understand why he has gone bad and Solané explains that the injustices committed upon him have driven him to this point. Genoveva refuses to run off with him because of his threat to her daughter. Angry, Solané signals the beginning of the attack on the town. Genoveva's father is murdered and soldiers capture Solané.

Act Three takes place in the prison. Mica has a plan to rescue the *curandero,* who seems to have aged and is in a trance-like state. He refuses to confess to either a priest or a judge and rejects the existence of God. Genoveva visits Solané and in the end forgives him, propelling the *curandero* to repent to God, whereupon unknown assailants shoot him to death through the window of his cell. When Mica discovers Solané dead she takes her own life and throws her body over his, ending the play.

Fernández used the main character and many of the events of the Tandil massacre to create his drama. Some of the minor roles have similar names as the participants in the actual events, but of the main characters, Solané is the only factual one. The preponderance of the events in the drama are also creations of the author. Fernández used only general information in his work: Solané and his profession, the geographical location of Tandil, proselytizing against foreigners and Masons, murders on 1 January 1872, and the mysteri-

ous murder in prison. Otherwise the entire plot is fictional and one must question his use of the label "drama histórico contemporáneo." But, what is Fernández trying to tell his audience? We know that the dramatist believed in the didactic qualities of popular theater from a letter/prologue he wrote to his brother-in-law about an earlier play, *La Triple Alianza* (1870).

> Para el pueblo, los cuadros plásticos, la fantasmagoría, los símbolos. Preséntale lo que se ve, lo que se palpa... y si es posible lo que se gusta . . . En esta forma, puedes infundirle, la enseñanza de un libro entero en tres horas, mientras que en un año no conseguirás hacerle apreciar una verdad, que en el caso que nos ocupa esa verdad trae carácter de urgente, urgentísimo. He aquí, entre otras muchas, la ventaja de la forma dramática por la cual me he decidido y que espero me hagas el favor de aceptar sin contradicción. (qtd. in De Diego 26-27)

Further on in the letter, Fernández gives us an idea of who his audience is; his didactic message is aimed at "el pueblo," or the working class.

> No es mi objeto recoger aplausos de una concurrencia en medio de iluminación y música, sino patentizar la verdad situacionista al pueblo; esto es, al gaucho, al soldado, al labrador, al pobre, al ilota, al saudra, en fin, hermanos mendicantes de luz, que los déspotas políticos y sociales hacen encorvar para sobre sus espaldas echar una arenga de libertad y derecho constitucional. (qtd. in De Diego 27)

Similar to José Hernández, Fernández sees the use of popular themes as a tool to court the masses and motivate the working classes. If we look at the dialogue of the characters and the themes that they discuss in *Solané*, we can get a sense of the messages Fernández was attempting to convey and the issues he wished to address (most of which are closely related to Hernández's intent in *El gaucho Martín Fierro*). There are three recurrent themes throughout the first version of *Solané*: the corruption and injustices of the city (and hence the government); the abuse and mistreatment of gauchos and rural workers; and the need for a strong, authoritative figure to take control.

From the opening scene of *Solané*, the characters lash out against the corruption and greed of the city. Burgos, one of the gaucho characters, says that he has been to the city once, when they rounded him up for a vote. He describes the city folk as "gente indina," suggesting their barbaric behavior (*OD* 345). The Solané character speaks of "las orgías impuras de la capital" (349) and "¡la ciudad! . . . ¡caburé funesto, que fascina con su mirada brillante, boa que envenena con su aliento!" (353). He has a negative description for every person he mentions that is associated with the city, such as Genoveva's husband Guillermo, who he describes as "el prototipo de esa juventud afeminada de las capitales" (387). Dressed in the latest fashion, he sent telegrams to Paris and pasted his hair on his forehead and made fake curls. Solané describes Guillermo as an opulent coward. With his attack on Guillermo, Solané associates the elite class in rural Tandil with the city, and the combination of the unjust policies of the city and her corrupt representatives in the country create the unbearable situation that exists.

> Civilización fatal, trampa artificiosa, cuyas piezas maestras son gobernantes arbitrarios con los débiles, cobardes con los fuertes, sin noble carácter, sin elevada política; gobernantes cuyo único afan es prepararse un lecho de rosas, desde donde sin zozobras ni peligros puedan contemplar despues, entre olas de sangre, á la sociedad que han precipitado en los horrores de la anarquía! (*OD* 372)

A second representative of the city and its corrupt values is Genoveva's father, Bidarte, whom Solané calls a heretic foreigner and an arrogant Mason (*OD* 374). In one scene Bidarte shows how ingrained with corruption the system is when, wanting to prove that his love for his daughter is more important to him than pride of class and his riches, he tells her that with a word to the Justice of the Peace the warrant for Solané can be called off.

López Jordán

Solané was written at a time when Fernández was supporting the revolution of Ricardo López Jordán in Entre Ríos. Hernández was writing *Martín Fierro* in the same year while cooped up in the Hotel Argentino in Buenos Aires, avoiding being discovered by the authorities who were looking for him for being a López Jordán supporter (Ludmer 212). López Jordán was the last of the grand *caudillos* and perhaps the greatest political threat to the presidency of Domingo Sarmiento. Disillusioned by the surrender of General Justo José de Urquiza and the Confederation forces to Bartolomé Mitre and Buenos Aires at the battle of Pavón in September 1862, the *caudillo* took control of the province of Entre Ríos after his followers assassinated Urquiza in 1870. López Jordán had been defeated earlier in a run for the governorship of the province by the candidate supported by Urquiza and Buenos Aires, and he and his followers felt strongly that Urquiza had sold out to the *porteño* capital. Although the revolution was very popular, Sarmiento sent federal troops under the command of the Minister of War, Emilio Mitre, to quash the rebellion. Sarmiento later appointed his own governor. López Jordán attempted to invade the littoral provinces again in 1873 and 1876. With his third defeat he retired to a ranch in Uruguay (Bosch 705-16; Chávez, *Vida* 161-89).

Fernández was an avid supporter of López Jordán and left his post as

scribe to Urquiza to become private secretary and chief propagandist for the revolutionary *caudillo*. The attacks on the city in *Solané* are a way of deconstructing Sarmiento's concept of civilization and barbarism; Fernández shows that it is the city that corrupts and is a negative influence, much as Hernández, who also fought alongside López Jordán, does in *Martín Fierro*. [8] The barbarism emanates from the urban areas and vulgarizes the innocent, rural folk. Tata Dios points out to Genoveva that he was not grossly ignorant, rather, he read, was intelligent and dignified. "Luchaba sobre los libros, para arrancarme á mi oscura condición, por el triple esfuerzo del trabajo, del saber y del sacrificio" (*OD* 388). Throughout the play the people from the country are described as honest and hard working, in contrast to the pretentiousness of the city folk.

Abuses and injustices perpetuated on the gauchos make up one of the most recurrent themes in both *Solané* and *Martín Fierro*. In the play gauchos are rounded up and carted to the city to cast a vote and stuff ballot boxes (*OD* 345), they are chained together and sent to the frontier (*OD* 354), sent to do the battles of the city while their women are prostituted (*OD* 359), and denied ownership of land (*OD* 370). "El gaucho, se encontraba, como siempre, humillado, embrutecido por el fanatismo y la ignorancia: cobarde como clase contra los prepotentes de las altas esferas" (*OD* 392). Solané describes the mentality of the elite when he argues with Lelia: "los hombres de tu clase, los que por la fortuna, el talento, ó el crimen, han logrado apoderarse del gobierno de la sociedad, miran al gaucho como á un fruto de maldición y de barbarie; como á una escrecencia, que es necesario destruir ¡civilizar dicen ellos!" (*OD* 362). One can see Fernández's writing is in support of a rural life and the popular classes similar to José Hernández in the first part of his *Martín Fierro*, published in 1872. Previously, Hernández had set out his agenda in the pages of his newspaper *El Río de la Plata*. He pushed for local town autonomy in the interior, abolishing the frontier press-gangs, popular elections for local officials, and more equitable land distribution. [9]

Solané's own story (the character's) is that of the honest, hard-working rural worker who is abused by the authorities, corrupted by the city and changed into a vengeful individual. After being chased out of the district for falling in love with a woman from the dominant class, Solané was pursued by justices and expatriated. He was treated like a pariah and when he went to the city to seek justice, he was exploited by lawyers and ignored by judges. "El gaucho ya no poseía hogar, ni familia, ni nombre, ni honra . . . ni sepultura, en la tierra de sus abuelos! Hui á Entre Ríos, á Santa-Fé, á todas las Provincias, en todas partes el gaucho era ciervo [sic] de la clase vencedora" (*OD* 391). Humiliated and insulted, Solané swore to spill blood for all of the abuse received. The character had turned into the vengeful brute that we now associate with *gauchesca* literature (cf. Martín Fierro, Juan Moreira, Hormiga Negra). The city and its "civilization" had managed to pervert and corrupt the

rural world. However, this was not just the world of fiction for Fernández; like Hernández, he expressed his opinions in the press. In an article written in *El Obrero Nacional* on 29 March 1870, we can see how he viewed the betrayal of the Urquiza government and the resultant conditions of the gauchos. [10]

> Si en nuestra conciencia ese gobierno ha violado la constitución, ha alquilado sin derecho la renta a Fragueiro [11] para que oprima al gaucho, que se empobrece en las campañas, que lo abandona todo por servir a su gobierno; si en nuestra opinión, ese gobierno, contra el sentimiento unánime y claro de la provincia, se abraza con el *unitarismo* para que éste venga a dominarnos, a hacer esclavos nuestros hijos; si ese gobierno deja despoblados los hogares arrancando los hombres a la fuerza para remetirlos a los unitarios de Buenos Aires, como está sucediendo; si, pues, todo esto es del dominio público y de nuestra conciencia, ¿no es justo, lógico y de nuestro estricto deber de defensores del pueblo el *desacreditar* a ese gobierno y cuantos malos y explotadores sin mérito le rodean? (qtd. in Chávez, *Vida* 243-44)

The strong message against Sarmiento in *Solané* reflects support for López Jordán and gives reasons to justify the revolution against Urquiza and those who sold out to Buenos Aires. Fernández alludes to the need for a strong figure in power to challenge the egotistical, autocratic government when Solané claims: "Seria necesario que un hombre con la cultura de la ciudad, con el sentimiento del gaucho, un Cristo, un hombre como yo, escalara al poder, para aplicar al bien á todas esas ilustraciones, esclavas de su propio egoismo, de su propia miseria! ¡Es mi sueño!" (*OD* 355). An analogy is set up between the character of Tata Dios and the *caudillo* Ricardo López Jordán. Fernández, as faithful follower of the Jordanist revolutionary movement, defends the need for a strong, charismatic character to rise from within and lead the local community. José Hernández similarly calls for a "real criollo" to rule the land; Martín Fierro's friend Sargento Cruz states that gauchos have to put up with constant abuses until death or "hasta que venga algún criollo / en esta tierra a mandar" (241). Also, as a Jordanist supporter, Hernández condemned Urquiza as the great traitor of the Confederation and said in a letter to López Jordán that his murder was deserved (Chávez, *José Hernández* 79). Interestingly, both Hernández and Fernández held important positions within the López Jordán revolutionary camp: the poet as the caudillo's main political adviser and the playwright as personal secretary and principal propagandist (Borello 84; Chávez, "Francisco" 146-53).

Changes in Life and Art

With the election of Nicolás Avellaneda to the presidency in 1874 and the failure of the third López Jordán revolution in 1876, Francisco Fernández left behind his military service and returned to his love for teaching and the theater. In 1877, Fernández's teaching was rewarded with the position of Inspector of Primary Schools for the province of Buenos Aires. That same year he was appointed to the board of directors of the *Sociedad Protectora del Teatro Nacional* (De Diego 49). The author never abandoned his friendship with López Jordán and De Diego even suggests that Fernández aided in the *caudillo*'s escape from prison in 1879 (52). Yet he began to drift away from the staunch federalist politics, and his liberal views are made clearer in the reworked version of *Solané* that was probably penned while López Jordán was in exile in Uruguay in the mid to late 1880s.

In the meantime, José Hernández returned to Buenos Aires permanently in 1875. President Avellaneda had been successful at achieving national reconciliation after twenty years of civil wars, and Hernández focused on cattle breeding and joined Adolfo Alsina's Autonomista party, opposed to Bartolomé Mitre's Partido nacionalista (Jitrik 100-03). The Autonomists represented the popular masses of Buenos Aires, while the *mitristas* stood for the harbor and merchant interests. Hernández would go on to become a senator and own a bookshop, but in 1879 he published the sequel to his popular poem, *La vuelta de Martín Fierro*.

As he did with much of his work, Francisco F. Fernández returned to *Solané* and reworked the play, adding an act, changing many dialogues and themes, and totally altering the personality of the main character. Most critics, including Castagnino, De Diego, Parodi and Chávez, prefer the first version for its "freshness and spontaneity" (Chávez, "Francisco" 169). What these critics mean to say is that the orginality of the play lies in the first version, because the revised edition benefited from theatrical and lyrical styles of a later era. The reworked version has more complete characters, stronger structure, and more linear plot. In the second version, there is a more convincing explanation of the love Solané felt for Genoveva; the female character Mica is more active and plays a more prominent role; events are connected rather than haphazard; and there are better details of the abuses committed by the authorities. The change in the structure to make the second version four versus three acts also helps balance the action and relieves the need for scenery changes in the middle of act one (although there is no evidence of the play ever being staged). What the first version offers is the originality of having the characters speak in a language characteristic of their social station, in particular the use of gaucho speech and vocabulary.

There are significant changes that appear from the very beginning. Fernández changed the subtitle of the play from "Drama histórico contemporáneo" to "Drama psico-sociológico"; when he was reworking the play into its second version the events in Tandil were no longer "contemporary." But the switch from "histórico" to "psico-sociológico" is curious. The author recognizes that his portrayal of the events in Tandil in 1872 were hardly historical and predominantly fictional. Furthermore, the rewriting of plot and dialogues in the later version create a more complex main character and reflect societal strife and problems in the entire community rather than the psychological, almost pathological, burdens of one character. Fernández's "psico-sociológico" label may be assumed to apply to the title character, but it applies analogously to the local culture and society.

In the second version, Fernández refines his description of the corruption of the authorities and the justice system with illustrations of the abuse of power and mistreatment of the gauchos. Representatives of the city, society and the government become even more one-dimensional. They have no redeeming or moral values. They are seen as lecherous tyrants who rule the land by their own whim and covet the locals' women.

There is a new scene in Act I of the reworked version, where Captain Bermúdez and his police officers are escorting four gauchos to jail. One of them is seriously wounded and dies en route. The gaucho Gabino is angry and protests that they killed him when he was already down and beaten. Bermúdez calls Gabino a "vago" to which the gaucho responds:

> ¡Vago! ¿y *ande* voy a trabajar si el gobierno ni el *estao* no me dan cuadra *e* tierra, de la tierra que ayudé a quitarle al indio? . . . ¡bien me arrepiento! . . .
>
> Me obligaron ustedes a buscarme la vida... *pa* dar de comer a mis «crías», porque la chacrita que trabajaba con mi padre anciano, nos la quitó el juez de paz, *apoyao* por Bidarte, gringo *indino!* . . . y si no hubiera *sío* por don Solané y su amigo Chaparro, que me ayudaron, yo hubiera *tenío* que hacer *cuatrero endeveras!* (277-78)

Unlike the first version where Solané and his followers come across as the outlaws at the beginning, the second version of the play distinctly differentiates the authorities from the gauchos, the bad from the good, the barbarians from the civilized. Gabino hurls further accusations at Bermúdez, accusing him of killing the dead gaucho because of an old debt and a woman's claims of sexual inadequacy. Gabino's accusations show that the authorities were not only cruel, but also unjust, resentful, vengeful and lecherous. As the third scene of the first act, this sets the tone for the remainder of the play. The gauchos' vagaries are blamed on the unjust treatment of the government with its forced levies and lack of help for those who give good service upon their return to civilization. The gaucho is painted as a victim of circumstance and not the lawless outlaw the authorities make him out to be.

In his comments, we can see that Gabino believes he would have become a true rustler if it had not been for the compassionate help of individuals like Solané and Chaparro. It is relevant that these two are juxtaposed to the justice of the peace and Bidarte. Solané and Chaparro are seen as good, the justice and Bidarte as sinister. Another fundamental change in this version of the drama is the appearance of the Chaparro character. He and Bidarte are foreigners. Bidarte is seen in an even more negative light than in the original. He is cast as a corrupt member of the upper class, and contrasted with the new character of Chaparro, a Basque merchant, a friend of Solané's, and an honest and hard-working individual. [12] This provides a profound change from the original work where there is a relentless attack on Masons and foreigners. In the updated version, a distinction is made between those "foreigners" or outsiders who represent the city, its wealth and corruption, and the working immigrant who attempts to establish himself in the community. A foreigner's sins no longer stem from his place of origin, rather from his connection to the corrupt city. In Act two, scene three, Solané comments on the immigrants who form part of his community: "¡El inmigrante! . . . ¡planta extraña, insinuándose en la flora indígena para mezclar su polen, y efectuar, en una nueva raza, la recíproca selección de la especie!" (*OTN* 304). When a group of Italians approach in a wagon, Solané says that they, too, are bohemians from other cultures, who sing their sorrows and are in search of bread and work (*OTN* 304). Gone are the harsh attacks on all things foreign presented by the Solané of the edition originally penned in 1872. No mention is made of Masons or masonry in the later version either. The focus of blame shifts from foreigners and Masons to the representatives of the city, the authorities, the wealthy merchants (who are often foreigners), and the government. A struggle is set up between the local community and the power of exterior forces. We can read this as a commentary of Fernández's federalist call for greater local autonomy, local control and less interference from outside, i.e. Buenos Aires. But in association with the Federalist Reformists, to use Hulet's term again, Fernández's liberal views are made clear in his support of immigration policies and defense of laws engendered by liberal thought.

In order to present this argument against outside influences, Fernández shifts the main theme of the play: Solané's personal struggle against injustice and his calls for vengeful violence are replaced by questions about local elections and popular representation in the second version. In the modified version of *Solané*, the title character never condones violence nor calls for an attack on anyone; instead, all of the violence is put in the mouths of the characters who represent authority. To keep Solané as the voice of reason the author adds another new character, Cochengo, who becomes the voice of violence within the *curandero*'s camp. When Cochengo suggests revolution and toppling the government, Solané responds that nothing good will come of bloodshed:

> ¡La violencia ciega del pueblo origina y amamanta la dictadura! . . . Así como la violencia ciega de la dictadura, la suicida: son dos demencias. El reciente crimen cometido por el presidente, para apoderarse de la provincia de Entre Ríos, seguirá goteando sangre y desgarrando las entrañas del país, ¡no sé por cuanto tiempo todavía! (*OTN* 301)

The known date of the Tandil massacre (1 January 1872) allows the reader to comprehend that the president mentioned is Sarmiento. The crime alluded to was the president's order in 1871 to forcibly remove Ricardo López Jordán from the governor's seat against the wishes of the population, as mentioned earlier.

At the time of the Tandil massacre, all of the local newspapers were also reporting irregularities in local elections across the country. In the subsequent presidential election in 1874 there were also numerous claims of improprieties and election fraud. Fernández seizes upon this issue as his weapon against outside influence in regional affairs. The nexus of the story in the reworked version of *Solané* is a parochial vote and the pressures the authorities apply on the locals to get reelected. Solané addresses his followers and tells them that they have two options: they may vote for the "oficialista" candidate, and receive some meat, money and permission to celebrate for a short time; or they can vote in their candidate, "un joven obscuro, sin oratoria de relumbrón; pero, sí, que comprende y anhela la justicia" (*OTN* 300). He will not be fake or corrupt, but if they choose the latter, the police will open fire on them. Solané consoles his friends who are worried about dying:

> Nuestras osamentas, unidas a las que ya blanquean en las sabanas de la Pampa, quedarán como acusación y marca imborrable contra las tiranías de estos tiempos! (. . .) El viento llevará el polvo glorioso de los mártires, sin perder un grano, a las cunas fértiles de las generaciones argentinas! (*OTN* 303)

In Act Three it is revealed that Bidarte, Commander Gómez and Bermúdez are plotting to prohibit Solané and his people from voting. The authorities' role seems to be to deny the rights of the citizens and to interfere with the concept of suffrage. The corruption in the government is distinctly seen when Bidarte suggests to Genoveva that it is pointless for Solané and his people to vote against them.

> La población se ha *llenao* de sus gauchos . . . ¡qué van a conseguir esos desgraciados contra el gobernador, sometido a su vez al presidente, que prendería fuego por las cuatro puntas a la República para que se quemen los caudillos y triunfe la civilización! ¡Grande hombre! (*OTN* 321)

His own unwitting accomplices criticize President Sarmiento. Sarmiento is seen as a more barbarous caudillo than those he describes in *Facundo*. The irony here is that Sarmiento is made out to be the violent fanatic that Solané was meant to have been; the civilized elite are seen as the barbarians that they criticize, and the civilization that they promote is as barbaric as the massacres that occurred in 1872. This is not merely political bickering or sour grapes on Fernández's part, as Sarmiento himself shows that the elections were, in fact, rigged when he states in a letter to a friend that the gauchos who resisted voting for the government candidates were jailed, sent to the stocks, or forcibly recruited to serve on the Indian frontier, whereupon they lost their possessions, land, and even women (Shumway 262).

In the final act of the revised version we find another significant change to the plot; Solané plays no role in the murders or attacks in town. Fernández adopts the conspiracy theory that circulated some weeks after the Tandil massacre in the Argentine press, and places the blame square on the shoulders of the local oligarchy. Articles in *La Tribuna* speculated that members of the governing class of Tandil had deliberately set up the massacre and it was they who later murdered Solané in order to keep their involvement secret (7 Jan 1872). A few days later, the same newspaper suggested that it was the immigrant citizens who murdered Tata Dios. It accused the immigrants of taking matters into their own hands because they were afraid they would be victims of further atrocities if the prisoners were released, and they had little or no confidence that the corrupt justice system would protect them (*La Tribuna* 11 Jan 1872). In the play, the gauchos are purely innocent bystanders. This time outsiders (immigrants and porteños) play the roles of both aggressors and aggrieved. We find out that Chaparro (honest immigrant) is murdered by order of the corrupt authorities (outsiders) and that Solané is denounced for the murder by Urrutia (deceitful immigrant), in exchange for which the authorities provided him with twenty-five cows to set up a farm.

> Lo desean y les conviene: ¡nos lo matarán esos miserables! . . . Ustedes no ignoran, que los asesinos de nuestro buen Chaparro fueron algunos facinerosos, *traídos de fuera*, pagados por los políticos y por estancieros deudores, que querían chancelar... Y del asesinato y del saqueo de la casa de comercio – ¡grosera invención! – acusan al mejor amigo de Chaparro, a Solané! (*OTN* 335 – my emphasis)

In the revised version of the play, Fernández creates a more complicated social dynamic and expresses with greater clarity a set of liberal federalist ideas. There is no longer a simple dichotomy between criollos and immigrants. The later version of *Solané* reveals more complicated social divisions. The Creoles are divided into gauchos and local landowners who are pitted against one another; the landowners wield regional power over employment, politics,

and finances, whereas the gaucho is tied to the land and caught in the landowners' web of interests and power. Foreigners are also split between the honest immigrant laborers and greedy European and porteño investors and merchants. A socio-economic class struggle is added to the more simplistic ethnic division found in the original play.[13] Fernández is blurring Sarmiento's civilization and barbarism paradigm.

All nefarious activity in the second version of *Solané* is carried out by outsiders who are represented symbolically by the Remington rifle. In July 1870, Carlos Kirschbaum, the representative of Remington of the US, offered Sarmiento the novelty of the Remington rifle and asked for permission to give a demonstration to his military officers (*Crónica* 252). The rifles would provide an important advantage to the national armed forces in their battles against López Jordán and later against the Indians. In the play, there are numerous references to Remingtons and always associated with outsiders. In the first act, El Negro refers to Commander Gómez: "El comandante ha *venío* a estos pagos, proseando . . . por supuesto, con un piquete de línea a *rimintón* . . . y *tamién,* como tienen plata, compran votos ¡sinvergüenzas que son, unos y otros, desde que los parieron!" (*OTN* 272). At the end of the play, Urrutia points a shiny Remington through the cell window and murders Solané (*OTN* 351). The American rifle is a symbol of power and aggression that always appears in the hands of outsiders – those under the sway of the capital city and not necessarily immigrants. The Remington reflects the strong influence of external forces in internal matters and is an instrument of control that overpowers and subdues its enemies.

All of the machinations carried out by the authorities in the play serve the purpose of arresting Solané and winning the elections. In other words, the corruption of the authorities – individuals placed in a position of power by the overbearing government in Buenos Aires – is of such a degree that they justify murder and false imprisonment to ensure a win in a local election. The uncivil and illegal action of the city is even more barbarous and abhorrent than the actions that the porteño elite heaps on the caudillos of the provinces. Fernández maintains that the governorship of López Jordán was no more illegitimate than the national government and that the actions of the revolutionary were peaceful and supported by the local populace, whereas the actions of Buenos Aires were unconscionable, illegal, and violent.

The Reformists' Liberal Federalism

In the last act of the revised version of *Solané*, we see a clear manifestation of Fernández's liberal views in his attack on the church. Our first clue that religion will play a different role in the second version comes in the list of characters at the beginning of the play. In the original version there is a long, detailed description of Solané's clothing and appearance.

> Solané: viste calzón-bombacha; camiseta de brin plomo; sobre esta un pañuelo en cabrestillo; bota granadera plegada; poncho pampa; sombrero fieltro de anchas alas, cuyas puntas caen hacia abajo; una imagen de la virgen María sobre el pecho; costado y pendiente del cuello por una cinta de cuero de potro, un bolsillo de piel de zorro, dentro del cual aparece un libro; al frente, aprisionado por una faja pampa, y sobresaliendo el cabo de asta de ciervo por entre la botonadura de la blusa, un puñal. Solané usaba barba poblada; su rostro era moreno pálido; pero simpático y con rasgos de viril y casi salvaje hermosura; el cabello lo trae á lo Jesucristo. (*OD* 341)

In the revised version, the description is reduced to: "Viste de blanco: sombrero de paja ala ancha, saco, bombacha, bota de becerro, pañuelo al cuello, poncho pampa al brazo; 40 años" (*OTN* 270). Gone are the image of the Virgin Mary and the Christlike haircut.

Fernández adds a scene to the last act in the revised version that contains a scathing attack on the church. A vengeful priest who attempts to get the prisoner to confess to the murder of Chaparro visits Solané in jail. Solané bitterly attacks the priest for condemning him when he knew he was innocent and for doing so for his own selfish reasons. He criticizes the church for its closed-mindedness and fanatical preaching. "¡Ah, padre, con vuestra doctrina de fe ciega, del sometimiento pasivo al dolor, de la renuncia a la lucha por el ideal positivo, entregáis al hombre a la tiranía, a la miseria, a la enervación; conducís la especie a una rápida decadencia!" (*OTN* 344). The argument between the two reveals the priest's choleric disdain towards liberal thinkers: "Todos los librepensadores, con sus ciencias, sus letras y sus artes profanas, chapalean en el barro humano" (*OTN* 345). He states that the church has the soft minds of the upper class in its hands because it is in charge of their children's education. When Solané replies that the popular classes do not support him, the priest argues that he scorns the masses and only wishes for the church to rule over those who control the country. "¡Despreciamos a la plebe! ¡Queremos reinar sobre los que reinan! ¡Y al niño hecho hombre lo mantendremos atado por la mujer, que es nuestra!" (*OTN* 346). Through the mouths of his characters Fernández voices his cynical view that the church is a corrupt institution with excessive powers and, as such, an obstacle in the path towards a democratic and free society.

In the final scene of the last act, Solané prays to Christ and states that the cross will no longer be the symbol of the Church, but a social symbol. He reveals that a scientific credo assures him that death will never kill his ideas; nature organizes, preserves and lasts, and when an apostle falls, another one rises up to take his place. Solané is then slain by Urrutia as El Negro plays a song on his guitar in the background:

> La sociedad siembra granos,
> que luego cosechará...
> el despotismo no es siembra
> de justicia y libertad! (*OTN* 351)

When Mica discovers Solané's lifeless body, she does not join him in death as in the first version of the play; instead she throws the knife out the window and yells at the thunderous night:

> ¡Noche borrascosa: sepulta en tus abismos el puñal: tú y él son el símbolo del gaucho, de todo el proletariado social. ¡Pero, el puñal deja de ser un instrumento libertario, ni jamás podrá ser lábaro en las luchas futuras! . . . ¡Pero, abajo también todas las Bastillas! . . . ¡Oyeme, Jerónimo: te lo jura la mujer, la amante y la madre: tu hijo va a ser la bandera pacífica que flame sobre la tumba del padre y del caudillo apóstol, que, al morir, dejó en su patria, semilla de la vida, verbo de justicia! (353)

In the reworked version of *Solané*, Tata Dios is reconceived as a peaceful, progressive-minded protector of civil rights. He is associated to the revolutionary López Jordán and labeled a defender of justice. The gauchos who surround him are representatives of the proletarian masses and in his place after death others will rise and fight for the principles that these two revolutionaries had championed.

The direct criticism of the church pushes Fernández's political agenda much closer to the liberal camp; so supportive is he of the immigration policies put forward by the likes of Mitre and Sarmiento (and implemented to full effect by the time of the Roca administration that succeeded Avellaneda), that he appropriates socialist terminology introduced into Argentina by the unions that appeared after the fall of the Paris Commune in 1872 and that germinated in the following decade (Falcón 510). Comparing the two editions of *Solané* demonstrates a development in the political thinking of Fernández. Not only do we see a shift in ideology between Fernández's two versions of the play, but we also discover close ties to a group of contemporary liberal-minded Federalist authors. We are able to see that those who battled on the side of the Federalists during the years of national organization in Argentina were not all close-minded, conservative, federalists who wished to maintain local power structures and an oppressive, almost feudal system. On the contrary, Fernández is an example of a progressive thinker who challenged the methods and means by which the Buenos Aires oligarchy attempted to achieve its goals.

This shift in ideology in a playwright who has not received the recognition afforded to other members of his generation, and evident through a dramatic play that has not drawn much attention from critics, would be of little interest if it did not help reveal a trend among Jordanist Federalists around the time of

the consolidation of the state.[14] José Hernández, Olegario Andrade, and Carlos Guido y Spano all moved into more tolerant, less contentious positions with regard to the centralized government. Their journalistic and literary activism against Buenos Aires localism and unjust treatment toward the interior of the country was toned down in the late 1870s as a new prosperity initiated in the country. The year 1880 marked a watershed in the country's development as the national government cemented its authority after the success of the Indian wars ("La Conquista del Desierto"), the capitalization of Buenos Aires, and the end of bloody conflicts between the interior and the port city (Katra 297-8). This change is seen in José Hernández when one juxtaposes the first and second parts of *Martín Fierro*. The original poem, commonly referred to as "La Ida" (1872), is a song of social protest and a defense of the gaucho way of life. Written seven years later, *La vuelta de Martín Fierro* betrays the populist ideal, as Shumway states, of the first part (286). In "La Vuelta" Hernández imparts moral values to the gauchos and exhorts them to educate themselves and resign themselves to the new system where they would play the role of domesticated ranch hands.[15] Carlos Guido y Spano and Olegario Andrade were also prolific in their journalistic attacks on Buenos Aires localism and the port city's unjust treatment of the people of the interior. Guido y Spano's notable poem "Nenia" (1871) was a funereal lament over the loss of life and destruction of Paraguay caused by the horrible war with Argentina and Brazil.

1880 and the Roca administration signaled an era of conformity and agreement on the socioeconomic course of development for the future. Previously active protesters and fervent defenders of the Interior, such as Hernández, Guido y Spano, and Andrade, yielded to the material comfort that swept across the country and accepted the consolidation of a centralist government as it could finally produce the desired goals of order, progress, and civilization. After 1880, Guido y Spano abandoned themes relating to Argentina's social reality and concentrated on lyrics of nature and love, which would earn him recognition as the nation's poet laureate (Katra 299). Olegario Andrade's tone and themes also changed with his move to Buenos Aires during the Avellaneda administration and he began to speak patriotically of the exciting positivist age that was looming on the Argentine horizon (Tiscornia LII). What Francisco F. Fernández shows us is that the progressive element of the Confederate federalism was not only something of a few cultured individuals, but that it trickled down through society. Of interest is how these ideas were generally widespread and how they moved vertically across class lines, and not just horizontally along an elite social class. As a dramatist, soldier, teacher, journalist and Jordanist revolutionary, Fernández offers us a glimpse of the perspective from the middle sectors of society. The modified political position being emitted in the revised version of *Solané* indicates an abandonment of the partisan factionalism and acceptance of the new nation state.

Conclusion

Perhaps Jorge Luis Borges understood best the importance that authors like Hernández and Fernández placed on the individual's relationship to society and the role he ought to play. In a short essay entitled "Nuestro pobre individualismo" (1946), Borges observes that the difference between Argentines and North Americans and most Europeans is that the South Americans do not identify with the state. The state is impersonal and an inconceivable abstraction, and hence the theft of public funds is not seen as a crime (*Obras* 658). For Europeans and North Americans the world is a cosmos; for Argentines it is chaos. This is why the Argentine popular heroes are those who fight or rebel as individuals against a posse or the law (e.g. Fierro, Moreira, Hormiga Negra, Don Segundo Sombra) (*Obras* 659). Borges praised Argentine individualism in 1946 as a response to the nationalist movement he despised that was gaining popularity at the time.

> El más urgente de los problemas de nuestra época (ya denunciado con profética lucidez por el casi olvidado Spencer) es la gradual intromisión del Estado en los actos del individuo; en la lucha con ese mal, cuyos nombres son el comunismo y nazismo, el individuo argentino, acaso inútil o perjudical hasta ahora, encontrará justificación y deberes.
>
> Sin esperanza y con nostalgia, pienso en la abstracta posibilidad de un partido que tuviera alguna afinidad con los argentinos; un partido que nos prometiera (digamos) un severo mínimo de gobierno. (*Obras* 659)

Similar to the populist agenda championed by such authors as José Hernández and Francisco Fernández in favor of individual rights and liberties for rural workers and the oppressed, Borges argues for less interference from the government in individual matters and a streamlined bureaucracy. While communism and Nazism are no longer threats, Borges's words and ideas continue to resonate today and are as germane as they were over a hundred and twenty years ago.

NOTES

* The author wishes to acknowledge that research for this article was supported in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education Fulbright-Hays Program and by the Middlebury College Leave Program.

[1] When I use the term *gaucho,* I am using a broad meaning of "rural worker," who is not necessarily involved in cattle rearing. See De la Fuente for an excellent analysis of the use of the term.

[2] The dictator Juan Manuel de Rosas had earlier required citizens to proclaim support of his regime (1829-32, 1835-52) by wearing a red ribbon attached to their clothing with the slogan "¡Viva la federación! ¡Mueran los salvajes Unitarios!" Red was the official color of the federalists. The term *gringo* was used to refer in general to foreigners.

[3] I gather my information about the murders from John Lynch, Richard Slatta and articles from the following newspapers that ran stories during the first weeks of 1872: *La Prensa*, *El Nacional*, *La Tribuna,* and *La República*. For more specific details of the murders, see Lynch 78-83; Slatta 169-71. The entire episode was fraught with irregularities and produced more questions than answers. John Lynch's recent book about the massacre studies all of the available sources. He presents the predominant theories and explores all possibilities; nevertheless there are many questions that will probably remain unanswered forever.

[4] The other five plays in Fernández's *Obras dramáticas* were described thus: "'Monteagudo' (drama americano-histórico en 3 actos); 'El Sol de Mayo' (drama alegórico en 4 actos); 'Clorinda' (drama veneciano, 5 actos); 'El Borracho' (drama en 4 actos); 'El Genio de América' (tragedia alegórica, 3 actos)." Ricardo Rojas and others state that the *Obras dramáticas* were first published in 1877 and then reedited in 1881. Chávez argues convincingly that the first edition never existed. In a letter in 1879, Fernández told Ricardo López Jordán that his dramas had not yet been published (Chávez "Francisco," 166).

[5] For some of the better studies of the gauchesque see Borges and Bioy Casares's introduction to *Poesía gauchesca*, Caillet-Bois, Ludmer, Olivera-Williams, and Rama.

[6] The terms *liberalism* and *liberal* have quite different meanings in Argentine history and politics compared to the ways they have been used in North America or Western Europe. The Liberal position centered in Buenos Aires, generally among the elite, educated upper classes. They advanced the ideas of imitating North American and European ways, while denigrating the Spanish heritage, and criticized their opponents as uneducated, mixed blooded barbarians. So as to avoid confusion I will use the Spanish term *liberales* when referring to the Buenos Aires Unitarians (centralists or Liberals) and reserve the term "liberal" to refer to the political theories and philosophies of such individuals as Lamennais, Quinet, and Michelet, for example. I make this distinction because, as I will discuss, there were "liberal" views and ideas coming from both the Unitarian and Federalist camps, supporting progress, democracy, a government based on laws, immigration, popular education, etc. Domingo F. Sarmiento's

Facundo is an important example of the elitist ideology emerging from the *liberales*. Nicolás Shumway accurately describes the alternative current of thought as "an ideologically messy, ill-defined, often contradictory tendency (or tendencies) which could be populist (...), reactionary (...), or genuinely federalist and progressive (...). No single idea unites this opposition to liberal elitism" (214). He refers to this alternative current as Nationalists. Among that group, I will distinguish what I shall refer to as Reformists, a term borrowed from Claude Hulet.

[7] Since there are two versions of the play *Solané* to which I will be referring, I will cite the first version as *OD* (Obras dramáticas) and the second as *OTN* (Orígenes del Teatro Nacional) parenthetically in the text with the page number(s). I have maintained all original spelling and accentuation. This quote comes from *OD* 370.

[8] Fernández would address the theme of the city as a corrupting influence in at least two more plays. In *Clorinda* Venice and in *Monteagudo* Lima act as metaphors of Buenos Aires as a destructive, despotic force (see Rodríguez 173). For more on the conflict between the city and the countryside in Hernández's *Martín Fierro*, see Martínez Estrada 707-11.

[9] For detailed studies of Hernández' writings in *El Río de la Plata*, see Borello, Halperín Donghi, and Jitrik.

[10] Fernández published in Olegario Andrade's newspapers *El Pueblo Entrerriano* and *El Porvenir*, in *El Obrero Nacional*, and in Pablo Díaz's *Aspiración Nacional.*

[11] Entre Ríos had been suffering growing economic problems since 1865. Urquiza's last governorship, 1868, was unable to improve the situation, so in 1869 the governor allowed Antonio Fragueiro to collect taxes in exchange for a $1M loan. Urquiza also allowed Fragueiro to name his own collectors, which lead to social unrest and Fernández's article (*Crónica* 244).

[12] The Chaparro character is clearly taken from one of the actual massacre victims, Juan Chapar. Also known as Chaparro, he was a thirty-four-year old French Basque, owner of a general store *(pulpería)* near Tandil. Eighteen people were slaughtered at Chapar's store, including the owner, his wife and four children who all had their throats slit. After sacking the store, the marauders destroyed the account book with the records of customers' debts (Lynch 83). Clara Lida sees the burning of the ledgers as a typical act of primitive resistance, but also evidently directed at those who perpetuated debt and poverty (550).

[13] Lida argues that the social antagonisms between marginalized Europeans and overseas capitalists were brought to the Americas during the latter part of the nineteenth century and that their secular class struggle continued in the New World (553).

[14] Rojas suggests that Fernández was ignored by critics and not given his due place in Argentine literary history because of his modest life, critics' disdain for early Argentine theater, and the heavy reading of some of his long compositions with shallow and difuse characters (13-14).

[15] See Ludmer for a thought-provoking reading of the didactic purpose of Hernández's *La Vuelta* (298-304).

WORKS CITED

Newspapers: *El Nacional*; *La Prensa*; *La República*; *La Tribuna*.

Borello, Rodolfo. *Hernández: Poesía y Política*. Buenos Aires: Plus Ultra, 1973.

Borges, Jorge Luis. *Obras completas, 1923-1972*. Ed. Carlos V. Frías. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1974.

Borges, Jorge Luis, and Adolfo Bioy Casares, Eds. *Poesía Gauchesca*. 2 vols. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1955.

Bosch, Beatriz. *Urquiza y su tiempo*. 2nd ed. Buenos Aires: Universitaria, 1980.

Caillet-Bois, Julio. "Introducción a la Poesía Gauchesca." *Historia de la Literatura Argentina*. Ed. Rafael Alberto Arrieta. Vol. III. Buenos Aires: Peuser, 1959. 49-89.

Castagnino, Raúl H. *Teatro Argentino Premoreirista (1600-1884)*. Buenos Aires: Plus Ultra, 1969.

Chávez, Fermín. "Francisco F. Fernández, periodista, dramaturgo y revolucionario." *Civilización y barbarie en la cultura argentina*. 2nd ed. Buenos Aires: Theoría, 1965. 129-74.

———. *José Hernández*. Buenos Aires: Plus Ultra, 1973.

———. *Vida y muerte de López Jordán*. Buenos Aires: Hyspamérica, 1986 (1957).

Crónica histórica argentina. Dir. Nicolás J. Gibelli. 2nd ed. Vol. 4. 5 vols. Buenos Aires: Codex, 1972.

De Diego, Jacobo. *Francisco Felipe Fernández*. Buenos Aires: A-Z Editora, 1987.

De la Fuente, Ariel. "«Gauchos», «Montoneros» y «Montoneras»." *Caudillismos Rioplatenses: Nuevas Miradas a un Viejo Problema*. Eds. Noemí Goldman and Ricardo Salvatore. Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 1998. 267-91.

Falcón, Ricardo. "Los trabajadores y el mundo del trabajo." *Nueva Historia Argentina: Liberalismo, estado y orden burgués (1852-1880)*. Ed. Marta Bonaudo. Vol. IV. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1999. 483-544.

Fernández, Francisco Felipe. *Obras Dramáticas*. Buenos Aires: Imprenta y Librería de Mayo, 1881.

———. "Solané". *Orígenes del Teatro Nacional*. Vol. 3. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Literatura Argentina, 1926.

Furt, Jorge M. "Noticia de *Solané*." *Orígenes del Teatro Nacional*. Vol. 3. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Literatura Argentina, 1926. 266-68.

Halperín Donghi, Tulio. *José Hernández y sus mundos*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1985.

———. *Proyecto y construcción de una nación (Argentina 1846-1880)*. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1980.

Hernández, José. *El Gaucho Martín Fierro. Poesía gauchesca*. Ed. Jorge B. Rivera. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1977. 189-383.

Hulet, Claude L. "La segunda generación romántica argentina: ensayo de apreciación histórico-política." *Cuadernos Americanos* 19(108).1 (1960): 232-48.

Jitrik, Noé. *José Hernández*. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, 1971.

Katra, William H. *The Argentine Generation of 1837: Echeverría, Alberdi, Sarmiento, Mitre*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1996.

Lida, Clara E. "Inmigración, etnicidad y xenofobia en la Argentina: La masacre de Tandil." *Revista de Indias* 58.214 (1998): 541-54.

Ludmer, Josefina. *El género gauchesco. Un tratado sobre la patria*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1988.

Lynch, John. *Massacre in the Pampas, 1872: Britain and Argentina in the Age of Migration*. Norman: U Oklahoma P, 1998.

Martínez Estrada, Ezequiel. *Muerte y transfiguración de Martín Fierro*. 4 vols. Vol. 3. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, 1983.

Olivera-Williams, María Rosa. *La poesía gauchesca: de Bartolomé Hidalgo a José Hernández: Respuesta Estética y Condicionamiento Social*. Xalapa, Mexico: Universidad Veracruzana, 1986.

Parodi, Roberto Ángel. *Fernández y Hernández y las dos versiones de "Solané"*. Concepción del Uruguay, Entre Ríos, Argentina: Ser, 1974.

Rama, Ángel. *Los gauchopolíticos rioplatenses*. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina, 1982.

Rodríguez, Martín. "Modos de tramar la historia en el *Facundo* y en el *Martín Fierro:* su productividad en la segunda fase del teatro de intertexto romántico (1852-1884)." *Itinerarios del teatro latinoamericano*. Ed. Osvaldo Pellettieri. Estudios de teatro iberoamericano y argentino. Buenos Aires: Galerna, 2000.

Rojas, Ricardo. *Un dramaturgo olvidado: Don Francisco Fernández y sus «Obras Dramáticas»*. Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Instituto de Literatura Argentina, 1923.

Sarmiento, Domingo F. *Facundo o civilización y barbarie*. Venezuela: Ayacucho, 1977.

Shumway, Nicolas. *The Invention of Argentina*. Berkeley: U California P, 1991.

Slatta, Richard W. *Gauchos & the Vanishing Frontier*: U Nebraska P, 1983.

Tiscornia, Eleuterio F. "Vida de Andrade." *Obras poéticas*. By Olegario V. Andrade. Buenos Aires: Academia Argentina de Letras, 1943.